

**CITY OF CHULA VISTA**

**GROWTH MANAGEMENT OVERSIGHT COMMISSION**

**2009 GMOC ANNUAL REPORT**

**Threshold Review Period 7/1/07 to 6/30/08**

**Commission Members**

Steve Palma, Chairman (Southwest)  
Russ Hall, Vice Chair (Center City)  
Bryan Felber, (Planning Commission Representative)  
David W. Krogh (Sweetwater/Bonita)  
Duane Bazzel (Environmental)  
Eric Sutton (Southeast)

**Staff**

Kim Vander Bie, Growth Management Coordinator  
Rabbia Phillip, Management Assistant

City of Chula Vista  
Planning and Building Department  
276 Fourth Avenue  
Chula Vista, CA 91910  
(619) 691-5101  
<http://www.chulavistaca.gov/>

**March 5, 2009**

**Approved by the Planning Commission (Resolution No. PCM 09-08) and  
City Council (Resolution No. 2009-\_\_\_\_) on March 5, 2009**

# GMOC Chair Cover Memo

DATE: March 5, 2009

TO: The Honorable Mayor and City Council  
Members of the Planning Commission  
City of Chula Vista

FROM: Steve Palma, Chairman  
Growth Management Oversight Commission (GMOC)

SUBJECT: 2009 GMOC Annual Report (July 1, 2007 to June 30, 2008, to the Current Time and Five-Year Forecast)

---

The GMOC is appreciative of the time and professional expertise given by the staff of various City departments, as well as the school districts and water districts in helping us complete this year's annual report. The comprehensive written and verbal reports presented to the GMOC illustrate the commitment of these dedicated professionals to serving the Chula Vista community. Special thanks to Rabbia Phillip and Kim Vander Bie, who provided direct staff support to the Commission.

I would like to recognize the commissioners of the GMOC: Vice-Chair Russ Hall, Duane Bazzel, Bryan Felber, David Krogh, Eric Sutton, and past member, Tim P. Jones. This dedicated and diverse team of citizens read numerous reports, listened to detailed presentations, and participated in hours of thoughtful and lively discussion about the impact of development on the "quality of life" in Chula Vista.

This year's report has been completed three months earlier than last year's. The reason for this is twofold: 1) So that City Council can consider any recommendations in time for budget considerations; and 2) So that the remaining GMOC meetings during this review cycle can be devoted to completing Top-to-Bottom revisions to the Growth Management Ordinance and Program Guidelines Document. Because growth has slowed down so dramatically over the past few years, the Commission views this as an opportunity to accelerate completion of this report, primarily focusing on threshold standards out of compliance, and to complete the Top-to-Bottom task.

As noted in years past, Chula Vista had been one of the fastest growing cities in the region and state, and, overall, the City has a good track record of providing the facilities and services necessary to accommodate the development. This is a testament to the current growth management program, and all the individual actions that have taken place.

Presently, however, we continue to be in the midst of a global economic downturn that has put the brakes on growth. Thus, in most respects, growth is not threatening the quality of life in Chula Vista today. To the contrary, lack of growth is threatening our ability to provide infrastructure and facilities because development impact fees (DIF's) have waned.

The Libraries threshold standard continues to be noncompliant, and the Finance Department projects that the proposed Rancho del Rey library branch, which would bring the threshold standard into compliance, will not be constructed until 2015.

Police, Priority II–Urgent Response Calls, also continues to be out of compliance. Nevertheless, the Police Department reported their best numbers in ten years. With potential staff reductions a possibility, however, the numbers may drop off again. The impacts of staff reductions could be far-reaching, impacting quality of life standards not measured by the threshold standards. This is a possibility for some of GMOC's other quality of life indicators, as well.

The Traffic threshold standard was non-compliant again this year; however, Engineering staff is strategically addressing the situation.

To summarize, three quality of life indicator threshold standards were determined by the GMOC to be out of compliance:

- Libraries
- Police
- Traffic

Eight were determined to be in compliance:

- Fiscal
- Air Quality
- Water
- Drainage
- Parks and Recreation
- Fire/EMS
- Schools
- Sewer

The following report includes a more detailed presentation of the eleven threshold standards, and identifies issues, findings, and recommendations to the Planning Commission and City Council.

# City of Chula Vista GROWTH MANAGEMENT OVERSIGHT COMMISSION 2009 Annual Report

---

## Table of Contents

<b>GMOC CHAIR COVER MEMO .....</b>	<b>1-2</b>
<b>TABLE OF CONTENTS .....</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>REPORT PREFACE – QUALITY OF LIFE: A BROAD OVERVIEW .....</b>	<b>4</b>
<b>1.0 INTRODUCTION .....</b>	<b>5</b>
1.1 Threshold Standards .....	5
1.2 The Growth Management Oversight Commission (GMOC) .....	5
1.3 GMOC 2009 Annual Review Process .....	6
1.4 Growth Forecast .....	6
1.5 Report Organization .....	6
<b>2.0 THRESHOLD COMPLIANCE SUMMARY .....</b>	<b>7</b>
<b>3.0 THRESHOLD COMPLIANCE DISCUSSIONS .....</b>	<b>8</b>
<b>3.1 Fiscal .....</b>	<b>8</b>
3.1.1 Prioritization of Projects Funded by PFDIF Program .....	8-9
<b>3.2 Air Quality .....</b>	<b>9</b>
3.2.1 Revision of Threshold Standard .....	9-10
<b>3.3 Sewer .....</b>	<b>10</b>
3.3.1 Long-Term Treatment Capacity .....	11
<b>3.4 Water .....</b>	<b>12-13</b>
3.4.1 Meeting Water Demands .....	13-14
<b>3.5 Libraries .....</b>	<b>14</b>
3.5.1 Library Building Plan .....	15-16
<b>3.6 Drainage .....</b>	<b>16</b>
3.6.1 Maintenance of Existing Drainage Channel .....	16-17
<b>3.7 Parks and Recreation .....</b>	<b>17</b>
3.7.1 Threshold Compliance .....	17-18
3.7.2 Threshold Standard Change .....	18
<b>3.8 Police .....</b>	<b>19</b>
3.8.1 Priority I Threshold Findings .....	20
3.8.2 Non-Compliance of Priority II Threshold .....	21-22
<b>3.9 Fire and Emergency Medical Services .....</b>	<b>22</b>
3.9.1 Reporting Period Consistency .....	22-23
3.9.2 Outsourcing Dispatch System to San Diego .....	23-24
<b>3.10 Traffic .....</b>	<b>24</b>
3.10.1 Non-Compliance of Threshold Standard .....	24-25
<b>3.11 Schools .....</b>	<b>26</b>
3.11.1 School District Accomplishments .....	26
<b>4.0 APPENDICES .....</b>	<b>27</b>
4.1 Appendix A – Growth Forecast .....	
4.2 Appendix B – Threshold Compliance Questionnaires .....	

## **Report Preface – Quality of Life: A Broad Overview**

---

The Growth Management Oversight Commission's (GMOC) principal task is to assess the impacts of growth on the community's quality of life, and to recommend corrective actions in areas where the City has the ability to act and/or can make a difference. This is an important and vital service. No other city in the region has an independent citizen body such as the GMOC to provide this kind of report card to an elected body.

The GMOC takes seriously its role of monitoring the impacts of growth and reporting to the City Council. The GMOC membership also believes that it has a responsibility to express concerns over issues that may not be part of the formal GMOC purview. For instance, maintenance and upkeep of necessary infrastructure for the City potentially impacts the quality of life for both current and future residents; increased costs of deferred maintenance could consume a significant amount of budget resources, thereby requiring cuts that may impact services, such as parks and libraries. The GMOC finds it important for this issue to be raised so that the City Council and the community have a full perspective regarding the City's quality of life. At the same time, the GMOC has tried to avoid duplication of effort, being mindful of the roles of other boards and commissions in taking the lead in addressing various types of issues, and to focus on its main priorities.

Despite the City's recent budget challenges, the GMOC believes the overall quality of life in Chula Vista remains good. However, it will be a test to maintain and improve the quality of life in the coming years as the City's limited resources will be needed to prevent degradation of City roads and facilities, and to construct needed new facilities, such as libraries and fire stations. The master-planned communities of eastern Chula Vista continue to be desirable and relatively affordable places to live, as home values have decreased significantly and foreclosed properties have escalated in recent months. The Otay Ranch Town Center is bringing in tax revenue and providing both residents and visitors from neighboring communities a pleasant venue for shopping, dining and entertainment. Initiatives for the Eastern Urban Center (EUC) and University Park and Research Center also continue to progress. In western Chula Vista and the Bayfront, the prospects for redevelopment give rise to opportunities for physical improvements to be realized, as they have in the east.

The 2005 General Plan includes an updated Growth Management Element that provides a framework for continuing the evolution of the City's Growth Management Program. A Growth Management Ordinance and Growth Management Program Guidelines are being revised and will move forward for City Council adoption in late 2009.

# **1.0 INTRODUCTION**

## **1.1 The Threshold Standards**

In November 1987, the City Council adopted the original Threshold Standards Policy for Chula Vista, establishing “quality-of-life” indicators for eleven public facility and service topics. These include: Fiscal, Air Quality, Sewer, Water, Libraries, Drainage, Parks & Recreation, Police, Fire/ Emergency Services, Traffic, and Schools. The Policy addresses each topic in terms of a goal, objective(s), a “threshold” or standard, and implementation measures. Adherence to these citywide standards is intended to preserve and enhance both the environment and residents’ quality of life as growth occurs.

## **1.2 The Growth Management Oversight Commission (GMOC)**

To provide an independent, annual, citywide Threshold Standards compliance review, the Growth Management Oversight Commission (GMOC) was created. It is composed of nine members representing each of the City’s four major geographic areas; a member of the Planning Commission; and a cross-section of interests, including education, environment, business, and development. During the past year, the education seat was vacant until February 3, 2009, when Steven Lizarraga joined the commission. Also, the development seat became vacant when Kevin O’Neill resigned from the commission on November 20, 2009, after nearly eight years of service; and the business seat became vacant when Tim P. Jones resigned in January 2009, after two years of service.

The GMOC’s review is structured around three timeframes:

1. A fiscal year cycle -- to accommodate City Council review of GMOC recommendations that may have budget implications. This 2009 Annual Report focuses on fiscal year July 1, 2007 through June 30, 2008;
2. The second half of 2008 and beginning of 2009 – to identify and address pertinent issues identified during this timeframe. This is to assure that the GMOC can and does respond to current events; and
3. A five-year forecast – The period from January 2009 through December 2013 is assessed for potential threshold compliance concerns. This assures that the GMOC has a future orientation.

To gather a status of development impacts to the city, the GMOC distributes questionnaires to city departments and outside agencies that have the responsibility of reporting on their respective threshold standards. When the questionnaires are completed, the GMOC reviews them and deliberates issues of compliance. They also evaluate the appropriateness of the threshold standards, whether they should be amended, and whether any new thresholds or standards should be considered.

## 1.3 GMOC 2009 Annual Review Process

The GMOC held nine meetings between October 2008 and March 2009, which were open to the public. In order to provide the commissioners with updates on threshold standards that were non-compliant during the previous review cycle, representatives from Libraries, Police and Engineering were guest speakers at some of the earlier meetings. In addition, they, along with representatives from other city departments and public agencies, attended meetings to discuss the questionnaires they had completed in response to the GMOC's request. (As noted in Section 1.2, above, the GMOC solicits input through questionnaires distributed regarding "quality of life" indicators for eleven public facility and service topics. The completed questionnaires are attached in Appendix C.) Through this process, city staff and the GMOC identified issues and conditions, and they are discussed in this report.

The final GMOC annual report is required to be transmitted through the Planning Commission to the City Council at a joint meeting, scheduled for March 5, 2009.

## 1.4 Growth Forecast

The Planning and Building Department annually prepares a Five-Year Growth Forecast, which was issued in October 2008. The Forecast provides departments and outside agencies with an estimate of the maximum amount of residential growth anticipated over the next five years. Copies of the Forecast were distributed with the GMOC questionnaires to help the departments and agencies determine if their respective public facilities/services would be able to accommodate the forecasted growth. The Growth Forecast from November 2008 through December 2013 indicated an additional 7,785 residential units could be permitted for construction in the City over the next five years, (7,065 in the east and 720 units in the west), for an annual average of 1,413 in the east and 144 units in the west, or just over 1,557 housing units permitted per year on average, citywide.

The projected units permitted per year on average, citywide, is down by 72 units from last year's forecast of 1,629 units.

## 1.5 Report Organization

The 2009 GMOC Annual Report is organized into four sections:

**Section 1:** Introduction; description of GMOC's role and review process; an explanation of the Residential Growth Forecast; and an outline of the 2009 report

**Section 2:** A threshold compliance summary in table format

**Section 3:** A threshold by threshold discussion of issues, acknowledgments, statements of concern (if any), and recommendations

**Section 4:** Appendices

## 2.0 THRESHOLD COMPLIANCE SUMMARY

The following table indicates a summary of the GMOC's conclusions regarding threshold standards for the 2009 annual review cycle. Eight thresholds were met and three were not.

<b>2009 THRESHOLD STANDARD – ANNUAL REVIEW SUMMARY</b>				
REVIEW PERIOD 7/1/07 THROUGH 6/30/08				
<b>Threshold</b>	<b>Threshold Met</b>	<b>Threshold Not Met</b>	<b>Potential of Future Non-compliance</b>	<b>Adopt/Fund Tactics to Achieve Compliance</b>
1. Fiscal	<b>X</b>		<b>X</b>	<b>X</b>
2. Air Quality	<b>X</b>			
3. Sewer	<b>X</b>			
4. Water	<b>X</b>			
5. Libraries		<b>X</b>	<b>X</b>	<b>X</b>
6. Drainage	<b>X</b>			
7. Parks & Recreation				
<i>Land</i>	<b>X</b>			
<i>Facilities</i>	<b>X</b>			
8. Police				
Priority I	<b>X</b>			
Priority II		<b>X</b>	<b>X</b>	<b>X</b>
9. Fire/EMS	<b>X</b>			
10. Traffic		<b>X</b>	<b>X</b>	<b>X</b>
11. Schools				
CV Elementary School District	<b>X</b>			
Sweetwater Union High School District	<b>X</b>			



## 3.0 THRESHOLD COMPLIANCE DISCUSSIONS

### 3.1 FISCAL

#### Threshold Standards:

1. The GMOC shall be provided with an annual fiscal impact report which provides an evaluation of the impacts of growth on the City, both in terms of operations and capital improvements. This report should evaluate actual growth over the previous 12-month period, as well as projected growth over the next 12- to 18-month period, and 5-year period.
2. The GMOC shall be provided with an annual Development Impact Fee (DIF) Report, which provides an analysis of development impact fees collected and expended over the previous 12-month period.

#### Threshold Finding: In Compliance

---

#### 3.1.1 **Prioritization of Projects Funded By Public Facilities Development Impact Fees (PFDIF) Program**

**Issue:** Within the Public Facilities Development Impact Fees (PFDIF) program, there is no apparent prioritization of funding for facilities that are slated for construction.

**Discussion:** There are currently five large capital projects to be financed by the PFDIF program, including: 1) Rancho del Rey library; 2) EUC library; 3) EUC fire station; 4) Otay Ranch Village 4 recreation facility (70-acre park); and 5) Otay Ranch Village 4 aquatics facility (70-acre park). In addition, the program will finance the remaining debt obligation for the facilities previously constructed, various capital purchases (vehicles for fire stations, public works maintenance vehicles, etc.), and program administration.

In the past, decisions have been made by the City Council to accelerate the timing of the construction of certain public facilities funded through the PFDIF program, and in some instances, this has impacted the ability to meet Growth Management thresholds, such as the Libraries threshold, as discussed in last year's Annual Report. The City Council must be made aware of all of the impacts that public facility project timing changes could have before making these decisions.

The Finance Department expects to update the PFDIF program by December 2009, and will look to include additional facilities necessitated by the increased densities authorized by the 2005 General Plan and any subsequent amendments. The areas most likely to see additional

facilities added are Fire, Parks & Recreation, and Libraries. Once Master Plans are adopted for these systems, they will be added to the PFDIF program.

**Recommendation:** That City Council direct the City Manager to develop a facility prioritization policy that includes an explanation for how priorities are determined, how facilities would be funded, how they will be reported, and impacts of the expenditures. This policy should be used as a basis for all decisions by the City Council on any PFDIF funding proposals.

## **3.2 AIR QUALITY**

### **Threshold Standard:**

The GMOC shall be provided with an Annual Report which:

1. Provides an overview and evaluation of local development projects approved during the prior year to determine to what extent they implemented measures designed to foster air quality improvement pursuant to relevant regional and local air quality improvement strategies.
2. Identifies whether the City's development regulations, policies, and procedures are consistent with current applicable federal, state, and regional air quality regulations and programs.
3. Identifies non-development related activities being undertaken by the City toward compliance with relevant federal, state, and local regulations regarding air quality, and whether the City has achieved compliance.

The City shall provide a copy of said report to the Air Pollution Control District (APCD) for review and comment. In addition, the APCD shall report on overall regional and local air quality conditions, the status of regional air quality improvement implementation efforts under the Regional Air Quality Strategy and related federal and state programs, and the affect of those efforts/programs on the City of Chula Vista and local planning and development activities.

**Threshold Finding:** In Compliance

---

### **3.2.1 Revision of Threshold Standard**

**Issue:** The existing threshold standard does not include quantifiable benchmarks, making it difficult to determine whether acceptable air quality levels are being maintained.

**Discussion:** Currently, the threshold standard is more qualitative, making it difficult to determine whether or not compliance is maintained. Because carbon

emissions are influenced by a variety of environmental issues, such as water use, energy consumption, transportation levels and solid waste disposal, a more specific greenhouse gas emissions standard could be especially useful for assessing cumulative growth impacts. A new quantitative standard would also allow City staff to more effectively identify actions and resources to address air quality compliance concerns.

**Recommendation:** During the Top-to-Bottom review, the threshold standard should be revised to include incremental, quantitative benchmarks, such as including a benchmark to attain a 20% decrease in greenhouse gas emissions per capita, compared to the Climate Protection Program's 1990 emissions inventory.

### **3.3 SEWER**

#### **Threshold Standards:**

1. Sewage flows and volumes shall not exceed City Engineering Standards (75% of design capacity).
2. The City shall annually provide the San Diego Metropolitan Wastewater Authority with a 12 to 18-month development forecast and request confirmation that the projection is within the City's purchased capacity rights and an evaluation of their ability to accommodate the forecasted and continuing growth, or the City Public Works Department staff shall gather the necessary data. The information provided to the GMOC shall include:
  - a. Amount of current capacity now used or committed.
  - b. Ability of affected facilities to absorb forecasted growth.
  - c. Evaluation of funding and site availability for projected new facilities.
  - d. Other relevant information.

The growth forecast and Authority response letters shall be provided to the GMOC for inclusion in its review.

**Threshold Finding: In Compliance**

---

### 3.3.1. Long-Term Treatment Capacity

<i>SEWAGE - Flow and Treatment Capacity</i>					
Million Gallons per Day (MGD)	06/07 Fiscal Year	07/08 Fiscal Year	Projection for next 18 months	Projection for next 5 years	Projection for "Buildout"
<b>Average Flow</b>	<b>17.062</b>	<b>16.765</b>	<b>17.894</b>	<b>19.516</b>	<b>26.2</b>
<b>Capacity</b>	20.864	20.864	20.864	20.864	20.864

\*Buildout Projection based on Chula Vista Wastewater Master Plan (2005) utilizing the "Preferred Alternative" model as adopted in the 2005 General Plan

**Issue:** The City of Chula Vista's entitlement for treatment capacity will need to increase by 5 Million Gallons per Day (MGD) before build-out.

**Discussion:** While the 5-year forecast for Chula Vista's average daily sewage flow in Million Gallons per Day (MGD) does not exceed the City's treatment capacity allotted through City contracts with the City of San Diego's Metro System, the 2005 Wastewater Master Plan indicated that Chula Vista would need to acquire an additional 5 MGDs of treatment capacity to facilitate the City's build-out.

A study completed in 2007 analyzed potential Membrane Bioreactor (MBR) Wastewater Reclamation Plants at two locations within the City, each with a capacity to treat up to four million gallons per day (MGD). While the study concluded that it was feasible to construct the plant, questions remained regarding the infrastructure required to serve the project, emergency backup plans in case of power failure, and the use/disposal of recycled water generated by the plant throughout the year. Therefore, a scope of work for an additional study regarding a Chula Vista MBR plant is currently being finalized in a coordinated effort between City of Chula Vista and Otay Water District staff.

While this option is being considered, the City is still investigating other options for increasing sewer capacity, including the possibility of purchasing additional treatment capacity rights from the San Diego Metro System.

**Recommendation:** Continue to pursue the options of obtaining additional treatment capacity, or of constructing a wastewater reclamation plant in Chula Vista so that City Council can adopt a plan to bring additional capacity on-line by the time the existing capacity will be exhausted (perhaps by 2017).

### 3.4 WATER

#### Threshold Standards:

1. Developer will request and deliver to the City a service availability letter from the Water District for each project.
2. The City shall annually provide the San Diego County Water Authority, the Sweetwater Authority, and the Otay Municipal Water District with a 12-18 month development forecast and request evaluation of their ability to accommodate the forecast and continuing growth. The districts' replies should address the following:
  - a. Water availability to the City and Planning Area, considering both short and long term perspectives.
  - b. Amount of current capacity, including storage capacity, now used or committed.
  - c. Ability of affected facilities to absorb forecast growth.
  - d. Evaluation of funding and site availability for projected new facilities.
  - e. Other relevant information the districts desire to communicate to the City and GMOC.

**Threshold Finding:** In Compliance

---

#### Otay Water District

WATER SUPPLY CAPACITY (Million Gallons Per Day (MGD))					
	FY 2005/06	FY 2006/07	FY 2007/08	12-18 Month Projection	5 Year Projection
Total Flow Supply Capacity	138.7	144.7	144.7	144.7	152.7
Potable Storage Capacity	196.1	196.1	216.1	220.3	220.8
Non-Potable Storage Capacity	31.7	43.7	43.7	43.7	47.7
Potable Supply Flow Capacity	137.5	137.5	137.5	137.5	143.5
Non-Potable Supply Flow Capacity	1.2	7.2	7.2	7.2	9.2

## Sweetwater Authority

<b>WATER DEMAND and CAPACITY (Million Gallons Per Day (MGD))</b>			
	<b>FY2007 Consumption</b>	<b>12-18 Month Production Projection (ending 12/31/09)</b>	<b>5 -Year Production Projection (ending 12/31/09)</b>
Yearly Demand (Purchased by Consumers) (a,b)	7,868 (24,147 acre/feet)	8,017 (24,604 acre/feet)	8,635 (26,503 acre/feet)
Yearly Supply Capacity -- <b>LOCAL</b> (c)	13,140	13,140	14,600
Yearly Supply Capacity -- <b>IMPORTED</b> (d)	10,950	10,950	10,950
Yearly Supply Capacity -- <b>TOTAL</b> (e)	13,140	13,140	14,600
Storage Capacity --Treated Water (f)	43.35	43.35	44.55
Storage Capacity -- Raw Water (g)	17,421	17,421	17,421

Notes:

- Yearly demand is obtained from Water Usage Table, page 43, of the Sweetwater Authority (SWA) Financial Statement and converted to MG's.
- 12-18 month projection and 5 year projection from SWA Master Plan Update 2007.
- Local supply components include the Perdue Water Treatment Plant (30 mgd), Reynolds Desalination Plant (4 mgd), and National City Wells (2 mgd), for a total of 36 mgd, or 13,140 MG per year. The Reynolds Desalination Plant production is scheduled to increase to 8 mgd in 2012 bringing the local supply capacity to 40 mgd or 14,600 MG per year.
- Imported supply includes 30 mgd, or 10,950 MG per year of imported raw water treated at the Perdue Plant. SWA can substitute, or supplement this with imported treated water through its 40 mgd treated water connection. Total supply capacity, however is limited by conveyance capacity and imported water availability.
- Total yearly supply capacity of 36 mgd, or 13,140 MG per year, includes the Perdue Water Treatment Plant (30 mgd), Reynolds Desalination Plant (4mgd), and National City Wells (2 mgd). The Reynolds Desalination Plant production is scheduled to increase to 8 mgd in 2012 bringing the total supply capacity to 40 mgd, or 14,600 MG per year. SWA can substitute, or supplement this with imported treated water through its 40 mgd treated water connection. Total supply capacity, however is limited by conveyance capacity and imported water availability.
- SWA Master Plan Update 2007 lists existing and recommended treated water storage.
- Raw water storage capacity equals 28,079 ac-ft at Sweetwater Reservoir, and 25,387 ac-ft at Loveland Reservoir for a total of 53,466 ac-ft.

### 3.4.1 Meeting Water Demands

**Issue:** None

**Discussion:** Otay Water District and Sweetwater Authority serve the City of Chula Vista, and both report that they will be able to meet the water demands of anticipated growth over the next five years, even when the region is in a "drought watch." Both agencies promote water conservation and have drought response conservation programs.

### **Otay Water District**

To ensure that it always has ample water supply, Otay Water District actively works to diversify its water resources. This includes negotiating agreements with neighboring water agencies, investigating local groundwater aquifers, supporting efforts to develop ocean water desalination, supporting agricultural to urban water transfers, and promoting the use of recycled water.

Otay Water District indicates that capital improvement program (CIP) facilities are built as needed, and are currently in various stages of development to meet water demands. Their six-year CIP documentation can be found, viewed, and downloaded from the Otay Water District web site at <http://www.otaywater.gov/owd/index.aspx>

### **Sweetwater Authority**

Sweetwater Authority has a diverse water supply portfolio, including local wells (San Diego Formation) and reservoirs (Sweetwater and Loveland), and is not heavily dependent on imported water supplies.

The Authority is monitoring future development activities within the City of Chula Vista, which may require major infrastructure coordination.

**Recommendation:** That the City continue to work with Otay Water District and Sweetwater Authority to maintain and track future development in order to continue to meet the water availability threshold.

## **3.5 LIBRARIES**

### **Threshold Standard:**

The City shall construct 60,000 gross square feet (GSF) of additional library space, over the June 30, 2000 GSF total, in the area east of Interstate 805 by build-out. The construction of said facilities shall be phased such that the City will not fall below the citywide ratio of 500 GSF per 1,000 population. Library facilities are to be adequately equipped and staffed.

**Threshold Finding:** Non-Compliance

---

### 3.5.1 Library Building Plan

LIBRARIES			
	Population	Total Gross Square Footage of Library Facilities	Gross Square Feet of Library Facilities Per 1000 Population
Threshold	X	X	500 Sq. Ft.
FY 1998-99	169,265	102,000	603
FY 1999-00	178,645	102,000	571
FY 2000-01	187,444	102,000	544
FY 2001-02	195,000	102,000	<b>523</b>
FY 2002-03	203,000	102,000	<b>502</b>
FY 2003-04	211,800	102,000	482
FY 2004-05	220,000	102,000	464
FY 2005-06	223,423	102,000	457
FY 2006-07*	227,723	102,000	448
FY 2007-08	231,305	102,000	441
12-Month Projection - 12/31/09)	232,307	102,000	439
5-Year Projection - (2013)	255,400	102,000	399

**Issue:** For the fifth consecutive year, the city has not complied with the threshold standard of providing 500 gross square feet of library facilities per 1000 people. Of the five remaining Public Facilities Development Impact Fee (PFDIF) projects, construction of the Rancho del Rey library branch should be top priority.

**Discussion:** The Library Threshold Standard Implementation Measure requires that the City Council formally adopt and fund tactics to bring the library system into conformance, and that construction, or another actual solution, shall be scheduled to commence within three years of the threshold not being satisfied (June 2007).

The County's 12,000 square-foot Bonita-Sunnyside Library is located on Chula Vista property, and is regularly patronized by 15,900 Chula Vista residents. If the square footage of that library were added to Chula Vista's 102,000 square feet of libraries (Civic Center, South Chula Vista, and EastLake) the threshold of 500 square feet of library space per 1,000 population would still not be met. There would be a slight (roughly 10%) improvement, however. Factoring in the Bonita-Sunnyside Library since it opened during the 2006/07 review cycle would bring the adjusted gross square feet to 500 in 2006/07 and to 492 during the 2007/08 review cycle. The 12-month projection brings it down to 490, and the 5-year projection brings it to 446 without the addition of the 30,000 square-foot Rancho del Rey library branch, or the Eastern Urban Center (EUC) library.



Current estimates from the Finance Department indicate that construction of a new library would not commence until 2015, at the earliest, depending on economic conditions.

Staffing the new library will be another issue. Due to budget cuts, the City's existing libraries have reduced their hours of operation by approximately 15% per annum. Prior to this reduction, Chula Vista had the best hours in south county; they are now amongst the worst, however.

**Recommendation:** That the City Council designate delivery of the Rancho del Rey library branch the top priority of the five remaining PFDIF projects.

## 3.6 DRAINAGE

### Threshold Standards:

1. Storm water flows and volumes shall not exceed City Engineering standards.
2. The GMOC shall annually review the performance of the City's storm drain system to determine its ability to meet that goal.

**Threshold Finding:** In Compliance

---

### 3.6.1 Maintenance of Existing Drainage Channels

**Issue:** There is a lack of funding to maintain some existing drainage channels.

**Discussion:** Throughout the City, there is development that occurred, involving some drainage channels, before Development Impact Fees were levied. Therefore, funding maintenance of these channels, including obtaining necessary, but costly, environmental permits, has become challenging.

The City's Public Works Operations staff is very familiar with the channels that require the most attention, and they monitor and remove large debris (furniture, transmissions, etc.) from them on a regular basis. Without required environmental permits, however, they are not allowed to remove plant material and silt.

Seeking a less expensive, streamlined process for obtaining required permits, the City participated in a Regional Channel Maintenance Workgroup for three-and-a-half years, which produced a document in August 2008 titled *Channel Maintenance Programmatic Permitting Guide*. The Guide provides useful guidance and tools for obtaining environmental permits from resource agencies, such as the United States Army Corps of Engineers and the Regional Water Quality Control Board. However, it is ultimately the responsibility of individual jurisdictions to apply for

necessary permits before any non-exempt maintenance activities can be conducted within open channels.

**Recommendation:** Continue to explore funding options to cover the cost of maintaining drainage channels, including obtaining necessary environmental permits.

## **3.7 PARKS & RECREATION**

### **Threshold Standard:**

Three acres of neighborhood and community parkland with appropriate facilities shall be provided per 1,000 residents east of I-805.

### **Threshold Finding: In Compliance**

---

#### **3.7.1 Threshold Compliance**

**Issue:** None

**Discussion:** The parkland threshold standard is in compliance for the period under review. Current (6/30/08) eastern Chula Vista parkland inventory will provide adequate acreage to accommodate up to 129,813 persons. With a current population of 111,507 persons in the east, there is a current developed parkland overage of 54.91 acres.

The 18-month forecast projects an eastern Chula Vista population of 113,953 (an increase of 2,446). The increase would necessitate an additional 7.34 acres of developed parkland. With a current overage of 54.91 acres, east inventories are adequate to accommodate the anticipated 18-month population forecast.

It is anticipated that the 5-year population forecast of 132,920 for eastern Chula Vista (an increase of 21,413) will also be accommodated by required parkland acreage. With Mount San Miguel Community Park under construction, and All Seasons Park slated for construction in the near future, as well as Park P-3 in Village 2, Phase 1 of the Otay Ranch Community Park, there will be 44.58 acres of additional parkland, bringing the eastern Chula Vista parkland inventory to 434.02 acres, which can accommodate a population 144,673. This would result in a projected overage of 35.26 acres.

**Discussion:** During the period under review, the facilities sited within the requisite park acreage are consistent with the types of facilities identified in the City's Park and Recreation Master Plan and are, therefore considered "appropriate" in the context of the threshold standard, which does not identify a quantity of facilities necessary to be in compliance. The City's

Park and Recreation Master Plan and the parkland dedication ordinance has a formula, however, to determine the quantity of facilities necessary to meet the recreational demand of the residents. Based on the formula, certain types of facilities (e.g., practice softball fields, baseball fields, practice soccer fields, tennis courts, basketball courts, and swimming pools) are currently experiencing shortages in terms of meeting current demands, although some of the demand for these fields and courts is being met at non-public park sites, such as school sites.

**Recommendation:** None

### **3.7.2 Threshold Standard Change**

**Issue:** The Parks & Recreation threshold standard should be changed to address new growth, citywide.

**Discussion:** The existing threshold standard for Parks & Recreation specifies that three acres of neighborhood and community park land with appropriate facilities shall be provided per 1,000 residents east of Interstate 805. The ratio is currently being satisfied, and the threshold standard monitors that. However, in western Chula Vista, it is anticipated that there will be new population growth with requisite park and recreation needs, thereby necessitating a citywide threshold standard. Therefore, it is recommended that a citywide standard be used that can ensure that parks and recreation facilities keep pace with new growth. Additionally, it should be ensured that all parks developed with funding from new residential growth west of I-805 be developed within this area.

The current ratio of parks west of Interstate 805 is approximately 1.15 acres per 1,000 residents (.91 acres per 1,000 between Interstates 5 and 805). It will take an additional 157 acres of park land to achieve a citywide ratio of 3 acres per 1,000 residents; however, new development cannot be made legally responsible for increasing park land above 3 acres per 1,000 new residents resulting from new development. Beyond the responsibilities of new development, creative new strategies for increasing developed park land west of Interstate 805 are needed to build upon pre-existing park acreage levels.

**Recommendation:** 1) As part of the Top-to-Bottom review, the Parks & Recreation threshold standard should be amended to read: "Three acres of park land, with appropriate facilities, shall be provided per 1,000 residents for new development, citywide."  
2) A City policy should be adopted that requires that all new parks developed with funding from new residential growth west of Interstate 805 be developed within this area.

## 3.8 POLICE

### Threshold Standard:

#### Priority I

*Emergency Response:* Properly equipped and staffed police units shall respond to 81% of the Priority I emergency calls throughout the City within seven (7) minutes and shall maintain an average response time to all Priority I calls of five minutes and thirty seconds (5.5 minutes) or less (measured annually).

#### Priority II

*Urgent Response:* Properly equipped and staffed police units shall respond to 57% of the Priority II urgent calls throughout the City within seven (7) minutes and shall maintain an average response time to all Priority II calls of seven minutes and thirty seconds (7.5 minutes) or less (measured annually).

### Threshold Finding:

Priority I: Compliance  
Priority II: Non-Compliance

Threshold Standard	Percent	Time	AverageTime
Emergency Response (Priority 1)	81.0%	7 minutes	5:30 min./sec.
Urgent Response (Priority 2)	57.0%	7 minutes	7:30 min./sec
<b>Actual</b>			
Emergency Response (Priority 1)	87.9%	7 minutes	4:19 min./sec.
Urgent Response (Priority 2)	53.1%	7 minutes	9:18 min./sec.

---

### 3.8.1

### Priority I Threshold Findings

PRIORITY I CFS – Emergency Response, Calls For Service			
	Call Volume	% of Call Response w/in 7 Minutes	Average Response Time
<b>Threshold</b>		<b>81.0%</b>	<b>5:30</b>
<b>FY 2007-08</b>	<b>1,006 of 74,192</b>	<b>87.9%</b>	<b>4:19</b>
<b>FY 2006-07</b>	<b>976 of 74,277</b>	<b>84.5%</b>	<b>4:59</b>
<b>FY 2005-06</b>	<b>1,068 of 73,075</b>	<b>82.3%</b>	<b>4:51</b>
<b>FY 2004-05</b>	<b>1,289 of 74,106</b>	<b>80.0%</b>	<b>5:11</b>
<b>FY 2003-04</b>	<b>1,322 of 71,000</b>	<b>82.1%</b>	<b>4:52</b>
<b>FY 2002-03</b>	<b>1,424 of 71,268</b>	<b>80.8%</b>	<b>4:55</b>
<b>FY 2001-02<sup>1</sup></b>	<b>1,539 of 71,859</b>	<b>80.0%</b>	<b>5:07</b>
<b>FY 2000-01</b>	<b>1,734 of 73,977</b>	<b>79.7%</b>	<b>5:13</b>
<b>FY 1999-00</b>	<b>1,750 of 76,738</b>	<b>75.9%</b>	<b>5:21</b>
<b>CY 1999<sup>2</sup></b>	<b>1,890 of 74,405</b>	<b>70.9%</b>	<b>5:50</b>
<b>FY 1997-98</b>	<b>1,512 of 69,196</b>	<b>74.8%</b>	<b>5:47</b>
<b>FY 1996-97</b>	<b>1,968 of 69,904</b>	<b>83.8%</b>	<b>4:52</b>
<b>FY 1995-96</b>	<b>1,915 of 71,197</b>	<b>83.0%</b>	<b>4:46</b>

**Issue:** None

**Discussion:** During the period under review, the Police Department responded to 87.9% of Priority I Emergency Response calls within 7 minutes, a significant three percent better than last year, and 6.9% better than the threshold standard requires.

With an average response time of 4 minutes and 19 seconds, the response time improved by 40 seconds from last year, and is 1 minute and 11 seconds better than the threshold standard requires.

**Recommendation:** None

<sup>1</sup> All figures after FY 2000-2001 (as well as Priority II figures on the next page) reflect a change in citizen-initiated call reporting criteria. Prior to FY 01-02, citizen-initiated calls were determined according to call type; they are now determined according to received source.

<sup>2</sup> The FY98-99 GMOC report used calendar 1999 data due to the implementation of the new CAD system in mid-1998.

### 3.8.2

### Non-Compliance of Priority II Threshold

PRIORITY II CFS – Urgent Response, Calls for Service			
	Call Volume	% of Call Response w/in 7 Minutes	Average Response Time*
<b>Threshold</b>		<b>57.0%</b>	<b>7:30</b>
FY 2007-08	23,955 of 74,192	53.1%	9:18
FY 2006-07	24,407 of 74,277	43.3%	11:18
FY 2005-06	24,876 of 73,075	40.0%	12:33
FY 2004-05	24,923 of 74,106	40.5%	11:40
FY 2003-04	24,741 of 71,000	48.4%	9:50
FY 2002-03	22,871 of 71,268	50.2%	9:24
FY 2001-02	22,199 of 71,859	45.6%	10:04
FY 2000-01	25,234 of 73,977	47.9%	9:38
FY 1999-00	23,898 of 76,738	46.4%	9:37
CY 1999	20,405 of 74,405	45.8%	9:35
FY 1997-98	22,342 of 69,196	52.9%	8:13
FY 1996-97	22,140 of 69,904	62.2%	6:50
FY 1995-96	21,743 of 71,197	64.5%	6:38

\* These figures do not include responses to false alarms beginning in FY 2002-03.

**Issue:** Priority II calls continue to fall short of complying with the threshold standard.

**Discussion:** For the 11<sup>th</sup> consecutive year, the threshold standard for Priority II - Urgent Response has not been met; however, the GMOC is very encouraged by significant improvements in response times. During the period under review, the percentage of call responses within 7 minutes improved a substantial 9.8%, the best percentage in ten years. At 53.1%, it falls 3.9 percentage points short of meeting the threshold standard.

The average response time during the period under review also improved significantly. At 9 minutes 18 seconds, there was a full two-minute improvement from the previous review cycle. Nearly two minutes short of the threshold standard, it is also the best average response time reported in ten years.

Police Department staff attributes these improvements to concentrating on the GMOC's recommendation to implement an action plan addressing the decline in performance relative to meeting the GMOC threshold standard for Priority II calls. The action plan included seeking suggestions from sergeants involved in a promotional process. All suggestions were reviewed and discussed by lieutenants and the patrol captain. Officers were also surveyed to determine their awareness of response time thresholds, and training on the thresholds was conducted.

Other factors contributing to the improved numbers included a new system in the patrol cars that allowed officers to see pending calls, including the priority level, on their computer screens. Additionally, during this review cycle, staffing levels in the patrol division were at the highest levels in recent years.

Police Department staff is confident that future technological advances will continue to help them get closer to the threshold standard. However, proposed budget cuts may result in a reduction of staff, which could negatively affect their ability to reach the threshold standard. In addition, the loss of officers could affect other quality of life issues not measured by the threshold standard. Areas potentially affected include the street team, judge unit and narcotics enforcements, which are proactive responses not directly affecting response times. Also, investigative services and community service officers, which are not part of the Department's core services or first responders

**Recommendation:** That the Police Department continue to implement its successful action plan and utilize the highest technology available to reach threshold standards.

### 3.9 FIRE / EMERGENCY MEDICAL SERVICES

#### Threshold Standard:

Emergency response: Properly equipped and staffed fire and medical units shall respond to calls throughout the city within seven (7) minutes in 80% (current service to be verified) of the cases (measured annually).

**Threshold Finding:** In Compliance

#### 3.9.1 Reporting Period Consistency

FIRE/EMS - Emergency Response Times			COMPARISON	
Review Period	Call Volume	% of All Call Response w/in 7:00 Minutes	Actual Response Time for 80% of Calls	Average Travel Time
<b>THRESHOLD</b>		<b>80%</b>		
FY 2008	9,883	86.9%	6:31	3:17
FY 2007	10,020	88.1%	6:24	3:30
CY 2006	10,390	85.2%	6:43	3:36
CY 2005	9907	81.6%	7:05	3:31
FY 2003-04	8420	72.9%	7:38	3:32
FY 2002-03	8088	75.5%	7:35	3:43
FY 2001-02	7626	69.7%	7:53	3:39

FY 2000-01	7128	80.8%
FY 1999-00	6654	79.7%

7:02	3:18
	3:29

**Note:** Reporting period for FY 2001-02 and 2002-03 is for October 1, 2002 to September 30, 2003. The difference in 2004 performance when compared to 2003 is within the 2.5% range of expected yearly variation and not statistically significant.

**Issue:** None

**Discussion:** The Fire response time threshold standard was met during fiscal year 2008.

While the number of calls from fiscal year 2007 to fiscal year 2008 decreased by 137, the 86.9 percent of calls responded to within 7 minutes was not an improvement. In fact, the percentage was slightly less (1.2%) than in fiscal year 2008. However, the 86.9 percentage was well within the threshold standard of 80% in 7 minutes.

**Recommendation:** None

### 3.9.2 Outsourcing Dispatch System to San Diego

**Issue:** Since outsourcing Chula Vista's emergency dispatch system, response times have gotten worse.

**Discussion:** Since March 2008, fire and medical dispatch calls for Chula Vista have been handled by dispatchers in San Diego, an arrangement that is supposed to save money and improve response times to emergency calls. As the table below indicates, however, response, dispatch and travel times all got worse between March 4 and June 30, 2008. At 82.2%, the percentage of calls responded to within 7 minutes decreased by 5.2 percent, edging close to the 80% threshold. The system allows San Diego and Chula Vista to communicate instantly, rather than having to pass information through multiple dispatch centers. Both cities are supposed to benefit by sharing resources, including fire engines, ladder trucks, brush engines and personnel. Despite the initial worsening of response times, the Fire Department is pleased with the transition to San Diego Dispatch and believes that the method of reporting may be a key factor in explaining the poorer times.

<b>Comparative Data Before and After Using San Diego Dispatch</b>		
	<b>Before 7/1/07 – 3/3/08</b>	<b>After 3/4/08 – 6/30/08</b>
<b>Call Volume</b>	6,871	3,012
<b>Average Response Time</b>	4:58	5:29
<b>Average Dispatch Time</b>	11 seconds	35 seconds
<b>Average Travel Time</b>	3:19	3:14
<b>% of Calls Within 7 Minutes</b>	87.4%	82.2%



**Recommendation:** That the Fire Chief continue to furnish the GMOC with data on call volume and response times since the transition to San Diego Dispatch.

### 3.10 TRAFFIC

#### Threshold Standard:

*Citywide:* Maintain Level of Service (LOS) "C" or better as measured by observed average travel speed on all signalized arterial segments, except that during peak hours a LOS "D" can occur for no more than two hours of the day.

*West of I-805:* Those signalized arterial segments that do not meet the standard above, may continue to operate at their current (year 1991) LOS, but shall not worsen.

**Threshold Finding:** Non-Compliance

---

#### 3.10.1 Non-Compliance of Threshold Standard

**Issue:** There were three non-compliant arterial segments during the period under review.

**Discussion:** There were six signalized arterial segments that failed to maintain Level of Service (LOS) "C" and three of the six operated at LOS "D", or less, for more than two hours a day. The three arterial segments, noted in the table below, do not comply with the threshold standard. One is located west of Interstate 805; the other two are located in eastern Chula Vista.

SEGMENT (Limits)	DIR	LOS 2008 (Hours)	LOS 2007 (Hours)	CHANGE
<b>Heritage Road</b> (Telegraph Canyon Road -- Olympic Parkway)	NB SB	C(1) D(4) E(1) B(1) C(5)	D(3) E(3) C(5) D(1)	+1D, -2E -1D
<b>Otay Lakes Road</b> (East H Street – Telegraph Canyon Road)	NB SB	C(5) D(1) C(2) D(4)	C(2) D(4) C(2) D(3) E(1)	-3D +1D, -1E
<b>Palomar Street</b> (Industrial Boulevard – Broadway)	EB WB	B(2) C(1) D(3) C(3) D(3)	C(4) D(2) C(5) D(1)	+1D +2D

Last review cycle, the Palomar Street (Industrial Boulevard / Broadway) segment, in western Chula Vista, was in compliance with the threshold standard. During this review cycle, however, the LOS got worse for both eastbound and westbound traffic. Fortunately, the problem is being remedied. In 2008, a state grant from the Traffic Light (Signal)

Synchronization Program (TLSP) was awarded, through SANDAG, to reduce vehicular delay by improving traffic signal synchronization along arterial roadways. Work has already commenced, and signal equipment improvements and corridor timing plan changes for the peak periods of the day will be completed in fiscal year 2009/10. The grant provides for new signal timing and communication equipment and consultant time for developing new signal plans.

The Otay Lakes Road (East H Street / Telegraph Canyon Road) segment, which did not meet the threshold standard last review cycle, showed considerable improvement during this review cycle. Northbound, there was a reduction of three hours of LOS D, and southbound, there was a one hour reduction in LOS E. Further improvements are expected during the next review cycle, due to the installation of new “adaptive traffic signal” hardware and software in November 2008. This system allows signals to adapt to varying vehicular peak period demands caused by Southwestern College. The City is currently in negotiations with Southwestern College for ultimate right-of-way needs for the college, frontage along East H Street and Otay Lakes Road. Widening for Otay Lakes Road is proposed for fiscal year 2009/10, and widening East H Street subsequently.

Heritage Road (Telegraph Canyon Road / Olympic Parkway) also continues to be non-compliant, but had considerable improvements, attributable to signal timing changes. Northbound, there was a reduction of two hours of LOS E, and one of LOS D, southbound. Staff will need to continue to make signal changes at this location in an attempt to bring it into compliance with the threshold standard. There was optimism that the opening of SR-125 in 2007 would help correct the problem on the Heritage Road segment. However, studies indicate that the improvements have been minor.

SR-125 opened in November 2007, after which City engineering staff monitored the impacts of the toll road on major east/west roadways in eastern Chula Vista. Their findings, which were presented in a report to City Council on June 17, 2008 and to the GMOC on November 20, 2008, showed that at the three most critical interchanges just east of Interstate 805 (East H Street, Telegraph Canyon Road and Olympic Parkway), there was a combined net reduction in vehicular traffic from 191,700 vehicles per day to 180,600, a reduction of about 11,100, or 5.8%,

In the last review cycle, northbound La Media Road (Telegraph Canyon / Olympic Parkway) was non-compliant. This review cycle, however, the northbound segment got no worse than LOS C.

**Recommendation:** 1) Continue to work with SANDAG on the TLSP grant for Palomar Street, to complete improvements in fiscal year 2009/10; 2) Report back to GMOC on the effects to overall vehicular delays at Otay Lakes Road since installation of upgrades to hardware and software; 3) Continue to improve signal timing changes at Heritage Road.

## 3.11 SCHOOLS

### Threshold Standard:

The City of Chula Vista shall annually provide the two local school districts Chula Vista Elementary School District (CVESD) and Sweetwater Union School District (SUHSD), with a 12-18 month forecast and request an evaluation of their ability to accommodate the forecasted and continuing growth. The Districts' replies should address the following:

1. Amount of current capacity now used or committed.
2. Ability to absorb forecasted growth in affected facilities.
3. Evaluation of funding and site availability for projected new facilities.
4. Other relevant information the Districts desire to communicate to the City and GMOC.

**Threshold Finding:** CVESD – In Compliance  
SUHSD – In Compliance

---

### 3.11.1 School District Accomplishments

#### Comment:

Both school districts indicate that additional facilities will be required to accommodate growth in the next five years, and that they will be constructed when funding is available.

#### Sweetwater Union High School District

- The District has a three-story, shared facilities campus design for future schools in Otay Ranch Village 11, including: Middle School No. 12 (grades 7-8) and High School No. 14 (grades 9-12). The Middle School is scheduled to commence construction in 2010 and be open by 2011. Construction of the high school should commence in 2011, and be open by 2013.

#### Chula Vista School Elementary District

- The District has a two-story design planned for its school in Village 11, which should commence construction in 2010. A similar design will be used in Village 2, which may commence construction in 2011.

Due to the passing of SB1556, the districts are anticipating funding from the state because it allows them to report the number of seats per high school attendance area, rather than the number of seats in the whole district.

## **4.0 Appendices**

### **4.1 Appendix A – Growth Forecast**

### **4.2 Appendix B – Threshold Compliance Questionnaires**